

## REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were originally pending in this application. On June 22, 2005, Applicant responded to a restriction requirement by electing to withdraw claims 11, 12, and 20-26. Claims 1-10 and 13-19 are currently pending. The Office has objected to: 1) claims 1-10, asserting that a phrase in claim 1 is unclear; 2) claims 13-19, asserting that a phrase in claim 13 is misleading; and 3) claim 14, asserting that the term "the vias" lacks antecedent basis. The Office has rejected claims 1-10 and 13-19 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakely et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,618,266) in view of Ehman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,021,050) and Chakravorty (U.S. Pat. No. 6,611,419). This is a non-final Office action and is responsive to Applicant's communication filed on June 22, 2005.

### Amendment to the Specification

Applicant asks that the amendment to the specification be entered into this application. In paragraph 22 of the specification, the term "detection" should be replaced with "direction." This change does not add new subject matter to the specification.

### Amendments to the Claims 1 and 13

Applicant asks that the amendments to the claims be entered into this application. The deficiencies objected to by the Office are corrected by the amendments. Applicant also amended the language defining the decoupling capacitors. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, for example in the last sentence of paragraph 19 and in paragraph 25.

### 103(a) Rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 13

The prior art of record does not show or suggest that "[embedded discrete surface mount] decoupling capacitors are aligned generally along the direction [perpendicular to the first and second reference plane layers] and overlapping one another," as required by Applicant. None of Blakely, Ehman, or Chakravorty shows or suggests embedded discrete surface mount capacitors that are aligned generally along the direction and are

overlapping one another. Only Chakravorty teaches embedded discrete surface mount capacitors at all, and Chakravorty is silent on the alignment and overlapping of the capacitors. The cited prior art is missing at least these required elements of Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant's claims are allowable.

**103(a) Rejection of the Dependent Claims**

Claims depending from claims 1 and 13 are allowable for at least the same reasons presented above.


CONCLUSION

Applicant asks that the Office reconsider this application and allow all pending claims. Please charge any fees that might be due, excluding the issue fee, to deposit account 14-0225.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Oct 21, 2005



Harden E. Stevens, III  
Reg. No. 55,649

NCR Corporation  
1700 South Patterson Blvd.  
Dayton, Ohio 45479

(803) 939-6505  
(803) 939-5521 (fax)